



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/361,678	07/27/1999	JONATHAN OLIVER	358.02	5818

7590 08/24/2004

Kevin Coleman
188 The Embarcadero
Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

EXAMINER

CHANNAVAJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2004

17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/361,678

Applicant(s)

OLIVER ET AL.

Examiner

Srirama Channavajjala

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Election

1. Examiner acknowledges applicants' election filed on 7/12/2004, paper no.15
2. Claims 1-34 pending in this application
3. Claim 35 is hereby withdrawn from examination

Drawings

4. The drawings filed on 7/27/1999 **NOT approved** by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152, formal drawings are required in response to this office action.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/21/2000, 4/21/2000 considered, a copy of IDS is hereby enclosed with this office action, paper no. # 17.

However, the following IDS filed on Jan 21,2000 are not received for consideration. Applicant is hereby required to submit these IDS along with Author, title, date, pertinent pages, etc, in response to this office action.

- a) Bowne Internet Solution, "Personalization", 8 pages
- b) About Alta Vista, "Our technology", 2 pages
- c) Product Datasheet, "The open Sesame Profiling server, 2 pages
- d) Philip Chan, "A non-invasive Learning approach to building web user profiles, computer science, florida institute of technology 6 pages

- e) Biomar Larsen et al. « fast and effective text mining using linear time document clustering » SRA international,inc.pp 16-22
- f) Susan Dumais, et al "Inductive learning algorithms and representations for text categorization," Microsoft research and computer science dept, Stanford univ, 8 pages.
- g) Lumeria, "an infomediary approach to the privacy problem," 22 pages
- h) Marko Grobelnik et al. "learning machine: design and implementation," department for intelligent systems, J.Stefan institute, Ljubljana, slovenia, pp 1-8
- i) Dunja Mladenic, "personal web watcher: design and implementation," department for intelligent systems, J.Stefan institute, Ljubljana, slovenia, pp 1-18.
- j) Andrew McCallum et al. « A comparison of event models for naive bayes text classification », 8 pages
- k) Myra Spiliopoulou, "The laborious way from data mining to web log mining", institut fur Wirtschaftsinformatik,Humboldt-Universitat zu Berlin,pp 1-21
- l) Data sheet, portal-in-a-box, autonomy's automated online information portal," product features, autonomy,inc 1 page, url=www.autonomy.com
- m) portal-in-a-box, product overview, autonomy,inc, 1 page, url=www.autonomy.com
- n) New Media, "Bringing full automation and true personalization to new media publishing," autonomy, inc. 8 pages, , url=www.autonomy.com
- o) autonomy technology white paper, autonomy, inc. 19 pages.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 18,30,33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 18 , A market analysis recite only steps, which are not in the Technological arts in that they fail to recite the steps as executed on or by a Computer.

For system Claim 30, the system comprises tracking, extracting, analyzing, constructing, determining, providing and the functional attributes thereof. These steps appear to be software per se, failing to be tangibly embodied.

For claim 33, A recommendation system recite only steps, which are not in the Technological art in that they fail to recite the steps as executed on or by a computer.

For claim 34, a system for providing personalized information to a user recite only steps. These steps appear to be software per se, failing to be tangibly embodied.

Further, Claims 18,30,33-34 do not produce a useful, concrete, tangible result in the Computer technological arts. The invention as disclosed and claimed does not promote the progress of the useful arts. Accordingly independent Claims 18,30,33-34 do not define statutory subject matter.

In analyzing Claims 18,30,33-34 for patent eligible subject matter, it is useful to first answer the question ***“What did applicant[s] invent?”*** In re Abele, 214 USPQ 682

(CCPA 1982). While the preamble for example Claim 7,33,68 characterizes the invention as "***A market analysis method:***" "***A system for creating a personalized display...***" "***A recommendation system***", "***A system for providing personalized information....***" a careful reading of the specification reveals that the applicant's invention can be best described as a method and /or a system for market analysis where grouping documents based on common concepts and summarizing into folders, filtering the content based on user profile and recommend, displaying.

Having determined in general what the invention is, we must analyze it under the prevailing case law. The statute itself allows for the patenting of method, systems, apparatus, and processes. However, it has been determined in many contexts that not all processes, methods, system and apparatus set forth patent eligible subject matter. One test that has recently been applied is whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, tangible result. See e.g., States Street Bank & Trust Co. v Signature Communications Inc., 47 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1998); AT&T Corp. V Excel Communications Inc., 50 USPQ2d 1447 (Fed. Cir. 1999). Under that test, the invention must have practical utility, it must produce an assured result, and it must not be merely an abstraction lacking in physical substance

As explained above, examiner further noted that the term or phrase "technological arts" is synonymous with the phrase or term "useful arts" as it appears in Article I, section 8 of the Constitution. *In re Waldbaum*, 173 USPQ 430 (CCPA 1972).

And for a claim to be statutory, it must be in the technological arts. *In re Musgrave*, 167 USPQ 280 (CCPA 1970) and *In re Johnston*, 183 USPQ 172 (CCPA 1974)

Claims 19-26,31-32, dependent on Claims 18,30 are also rejected in the analysis above and rejected on that basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zellweger, US Patent No. 6401096.

8. As to Claim 1, Zellweger teaches a system which including 'creating a personalized display for a user' [see fig 7], 'creating a database entry for each user of a client document server using a tracking module' [col 4, line 8-11, col 5, line 23-25, line 39-42], creating database entry corresponds to create and manage content menu in the data structure as detailed in fig 4, document server corresponds to Zellweger's server computer as detailed in fig 1, element 15;

'tracking requests by the user for at least one document on a client document server using the tracking module' [col 5, line 55-67];

'storing, in a database, information regarding each document tracked by the tracking module' [col 5, line 40-43, line 51-54];

'analyzing the stored information to construct a profile of the user' [col 6, line 23-29].

9. Claim 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jacobi et al., [hereafter Jacobi], US Patent No. 6317722.

10. As to Claim 1, Jacobi teaches a system which including 'creating a personalized display for a user' [see fig 6, col 8, line 24-25], 'creating a database entry for each user of a client document server using a tracking module' [fig 1,], creating database entry corresponds to Jacobi's fig 1, element 64, document server corresponds to Jacobi's web server, fig 1, element 32,

'tracking requests by the user for at least one document on a client document server using the tracking module' [col 3, line 43-48];

'storing, in a database, information regarding each document tracked by the tracking module' [col 7, line 45-58];

'analyzing the stored information to construct a profile of the user'
[col 9, line 41-51].

11. As to Claim 2, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'determining based on the user profile [see fig 1, element 38], 'using the at least one recommendation software application, the interests of the user' [col 3, line 43-48]; 'providing the user with recommended information, using the at least one recommendation software application, based upon the determined interests of the user' [col 3, line 43-48, col 6, line 52-67].

12. As to Claim 3, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'recommended information is selected from the group consisting of recommendation documents and recommendation packages' [col 5, line 57-67, col 6, line 1-1-6].

13. As to Claim 4, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'recommended information is selected from the group consisting of advertisements, products, animations, graphic displays, sound files, applets, and services' [col 4, line 66-67, col 5, line 1-10, col 12, line 10-13], Jacobi specifically teaches recommended information such as web sites, chat groups, movies, television shows, downloadable contents, book titles, video titles and like as detailed in col 5, line 1-10.

14. As to Claim 5, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'sending a user-identifier to the user's computer using the tracking module' [col 7, line 1-9]; 'sending the user-identifier and a document identifier to the database when the user moves to different document in the client's document server using the tracking module' [col 7, line 45-58].

15. As to Claim 6, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'stored information comprises content information' [col 7, line 53-58, fig 1].

16. As to Claim 7, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'client document server is a web site' [see fig 6, col 8, line 66-67].

17. As to Claim 8, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'tracking module comprises embedded HTML links to the marketing system' [col 8, line 60-67, col 9, line 1-3].

18. As to Claim 9, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'parsing, using the at least one recommendation software application, a set comprising information regarding at least one document viewed by the user' [col 10, line 46-51];

'determining, using the at least one recommendation software application, at least one common theme or concept of the set' [col 10, line 63-67, col 11, line 1-4];

'clustering into interest folders, using the at least one recommendation software application, the at least one document in the set according to the number of common themes or concepts in the at least one document' [col 11, line 40-45, line 62-65].

19. As to Claim 10, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'categorizing at least one document, using the at least one recommendation software application, according to the common themes or concepts of the interest folders' [col 12, line 4-13].

20. As to Claim 11, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'recommending to the user, using the at least one recommendation software application, the at least one categorized document' [col 12, line 39-48], categorized documents based on product ids as detailed in table 60.

21. As to Claim 12, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'analyzing step further comprises the step of using at least a first filter to extract selected content from each document tracked by the tracking module' [col 11, line 50-61], Jacobi specifically teaches filtering process as detailed in fig 2-3.

22. As to Claim 13, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'at least a second filter to extract structure information from within the extracted content' [see fig 2-3,col 14, line 1-7].

23. As to Claim 14, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'summarizing each interest folder, using the at least one recommendation software application, to determine at least one keyword from the at least one document in the interest folder' [fig 1, col 7, line 65-67, col 8, line 1-2], Jacobi specifically teaches search engine enabling users to query items or purchase items or simily search shopping catalog that uses key words or phrases and like.

24. As to Claim 15, Jacobi teaches a system which including 'a user viewing' [col 6, line 57-59]; 'using a computer' [see fig 1], a document from a client document server, the document containing internal content information' [see fig 1, fig 6, col 5, line 19-24];

'the client document server transmitting, using a computer, the internal content information of the viewed document to at least one recommendation software application' [see fig 1, col 7, line 34-44];

'the user receiving, on the computer, a list of links to at least one documents recommended by the at least one recommendation software application responsive to the transmitted internal content information' [fig 1, fig 6, col 16, line 6-14].

25. As to Claim 16, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 15 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'storing, using a computer, the internal content information in a database' [col 7, line 49-55].

26. As to Claim 17, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 16 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'analyzing, using a computer, the internal content information in the database to determine a profile of the user, wherein the profile is used to recommend the list of links' [fig 1 col 7, line 45-64], Jacobi specifically teaches database that stores user profile for example as detailed in fig 1, element 38, further user profile, purchase history determines for recommending items.

27. As to Claim 18, Jacobi teaches a system which including 'receiving, on a computer, internal content information of at least one document accessed by a user' [see fig 1, fig 6, col 7, line 30-41, line 65-67, col 8, line 1-2], Jacobi specifically teaches user computer(s) are connected through internet for example a search engine connected to a database;

'determining, using a computer, the theme and concepts of the at least one document' [col 8, line 7-17], Jacobi specifically teaches users personal shopping cart that processes the personal list, generating, maintaining user specific items;

'grouping, using a computer, the at least one documents into at least one interest folder according to common themes and concepts' [col 8, line 26-30];

'summarizing, using a computer, the at least one interest folder to extract at least one keyword representing the common themes and concepts of the interest folder' [col 8, line 63-67, col 9, line 1-7].

28. As to Claim 19, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 18 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'using a computer, an interest profile from the user's at least one interest folder' [col 10, line 56-62].

29. As to Claim 20, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 19 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'using a computer, the user's profile in accordance with instructions provided by the user' [col 10, line 63-67, col 11, line 1-4].

30. As to Claim 21-22, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 19 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'utilizing the interest profile, using a computer, to locate documents for recommendation to the user' [col 11, line 21-27].

31. As to Claim 23-24, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 22 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'personalized recommendation package is a personalized web start page' [fig 6, col 8, line 22-25, col 16, line 6-14].

32. As to Claim 25, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 24 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi

disclosed "Uniform Resource locator associated with the personalized web start page in the form of a link to the client document server" [col 8, line 22-25].

33. As to Claim 26, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 25 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Jacobi disclosed 'using a computer, syndicated information to the user in response to the user's profile' [col 8, line 55-59].

34. Claim 27-32,34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adar et al., [hereafter Adar] et al., [hereafter Adar], US Patent No. 6493702.

35. As to Claim 27, 30, Adar teaches a system which including 'customize information provided to a user over an electronic network' [see Abstract, fig 1];
'tracking requests by a user of a client document server for at least a first requested document on the client document server' [col 3, line 45-54, line 55-62];

'extracting filtered content from the at least first requested document'
[col 6, line 9-19]

'analyzing the filtered content of the at least first requested document'
[col 6, line 42-54];

'constructing a profile of the user from the analyzed content' [col 13, line 17-26];
'determining, based on the user profile, the interests of the user' [col 13, line 66-67, col 14, line 1-4].

'providing the user with recommended information based upon the determined interests of the user' [col 14, line 14-24, fig 14].

36. As to Claim 28, 31, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 27 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Adar disclosed 'determining the theme or concept of the at least first requested document' [col 13, line 7-12];

'clustering the at least first requested document into at least one interest folder according to the theme or concept in the document' [col 13, line 40-48];

'categorizing at least a second document, according to the theme or concept of the at least one interest folder' [col 17, line 9-15];

'recommending to the user the at least second categorized document' [see fig 14, col 14, line 18-27].

37. As to Claim 29,32, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 28 above. In addition, with respect to the claimed feature Adar disclosed 'summarizing the at least one interest folder to extract at least one keyword representing the theme or concept of the interest folder' [col 13, line 7-12];

'searching the at least second document for the at least one keyword to categorize the at least second document' [col 13, line 66-67, col 14, line 1-9].

38. As to Claim 34, Adar teaches a system which including 'a memory device having embodied therein information relating to at least one electronic document viewed by the user' [see fig 2];

'a processor in communication with the memory device, the processor configured to 'extract filtered content from the at least first viewed document' [[col 6, line 9-19]

'analyze the filtered content of the at least first viewed document' [col 6, line 42-54];

'determine the theme or concept of the at least first viewed document' [col 13, line 66-67, col 14, line 1-4];

'cluster the at least first requested document into at least one interest folder according to the theme or concept in the document' [col 13, line 40-48];

'construct a profile of the user from the analyzed content' col 13, line 17-26];

'determine the interests of the user based on the user profile [col 14, line 37-42].

'categorize at least second document, according to the theme or concept of the at least one interest folder' [col 17, line 9-15];

'recommend to the user the at least second categorized document' [see fig 14, col 14, line 18-27].

39. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boe et al., [hereafter Boe] et al., [hereafter Boe], US Patent No. 6236975.

40. As to Claim 33, Boe teaches a system which including 'a marketing system comprising at least a first computer with at least one recommendation software application operable thereon' [see Abstract, fig 1, col 3, line 2-6, line 9-12, col 4, line 31-38], Boe specifically teaches targeted marketing system using computer network as detailed in fig 1, first computer corresponds to fig 1, element 14;

'at least a second computer with at least one client document server operable thereon' [col 4, line 46-60], Boe specifically teaches customized reports from the business system element 14, further this business system is connected to the survey system typically have business survey reports that corresponds to document server, second computer corresponds to Boe's fig 1, element 12;

'at least a third computer operable to receive and display to a user at least one document from the client document server' [col 4, line 61-67, col 5, line 1-3, fig 4b-4f];

'a tracking module associated with the at least one client document server to track the display of the at least one document to the user and to provide information regarding the at least one document to the marketing system' [see fig 4c, 4e, col 10, line 9-33];

'at least one database accessible to the marketing system to store information associated with the at least one document displayed by the user' [col 10, line 51-67, col 11, line 1-6], database corresponds to Boe's fig 1, element 24;

'wherein the recommendation system is operable to analyze the information stored in the database to determine a profile of the user' [col 10, line 60-67,col 11, line 1-6, col 11, line 53-67].

'wherein the recommendation system is operable to recommend documents to the user in response to the determined profile' [fig 5a-b, col 14, line 44-53], Boe specifically suggests, once customer has selected specific required criteria, customer selected criteria is compared with matching database to provide specific recommendation(s) to the customer;

'wherein the recommendation system is operable to provide a personalized recommendation package to the user in response to the determined profile' [col 14, line 44-67,, col 15, line 1-7], Boe specifically suggests, matching database based on customer submitted information or data and allows business system to generate reports or recommendation package based on customer profile, more specifically customer's identification number as detailed in col 15, line 1-7.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- a. US Patent No. 6401096
- b. US Patent No. 6317722
- c. US Patent No. 6493702
- d. US Patent No. 6236975

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

- d. US Patent No. 6202083
- e. US Patent No. 6654735
- f. US Patent No. 6125173
- g. US Patent No. 6345293
- h. US Patent No. 6029141
- i. US Patent No. 6484149
- j. US Patent No. 5727129
- k. US Patent No. 6692359
- l. US Patent No. 5978799
- m. US Patent No 6202083
- n. US Patent No 6202083
- p. WO98/57490
- q. Qi et al., Efficient profile matching for large scale

webcasting, computer networks and ISDN systems, 30, 1998 pp 443-455

r. Hidekazu S, et al. Learning personal preferences on online newspaper articles from user behaviors, computer networks and ISDN systems 29, 1997 pp 1447-1455

s. Christian K et al. WebAssist : a user profile specific information retrieval assistant, short paper, computer networks and ISDN systems, 30 1998, pp 654-655.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is (703) 308-8538. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703/872-9306 (Official Communications)

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

SC *as*
Patent Examiner.
August 20, 2004.